



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,489	03/18/2004	Richard F. Barker JR.	41854-P002US	5706
39770	7590	04/21/2006		EXAMINER
SANFORD E. WARREN, JR. P.O. BOX 50784 DALLAS, TX 75201				SUERETH, SARAH ELIZABETH
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3749

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/803,489	BARKER ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Sarah Suereth	3749		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 19 and 20 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 3/18/04 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/10/04.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words.

Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Objections

3. Claims 19 and 20 are objected to because of the following informalities: line 1 in claims 19 and 20 states that they depend from claim 19. The Examiner is examining the claims as if they read -- the method of claim 18 -- . Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hunts 6525298.

6. Hunts discloses a towel warming device having a drawer frame (1) with a pair of side rails (Figure 1, two side walls, connecting element 5 to the wall opposite the door), a door (2) moveably connected to the front of the side rails to be positioned between an open and closed position, a removable tray (7) capable of holding food, and a locking mechanism (4, 5) in connection between the side rails and the door.

7. Regarding claim 6, the door is hingedly connected to the side rails proximate the front end thereof (col. 6, line 41).

8. Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koch 574336.

Koch discloses a stove having a cabinet (1) with a heating cavity (col. 1, lines 49-51); a drawer frame (9) having a pair of opposing side rails, each of the side rails having a front end and a terminal end (Fig. 1), the side rails being functionally connected with the side walls of the cabinet in a manner such that the drawer frame can be moved between an open position wherein the drawer frame extends substantially exterior of the heating cavity through the opening and a closed position wherein the drawer frame is

positioned substantially within the heating cavity (col. 2, lines 71-73), the front end of the side rails being positioned proximate the front wall and the terminal end being positioned proximate the back wall when the drawer frame is in the closed position (Figures 1 and 2); a door (20) moveably connected to the side rails of the drawer frame, the door moveable between an open position and a closed position; and a locking mechanism (13, 22, 24) in connection between the door and the side rails of the drawer frame for selectively maintaining the door in the closed position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

11. Claims 4, 5, 9, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunts in view of Roberts et al.

As noted in the 35 U.S.C. 102(b) rejection, Hunts discloses a magnetic latch mechanism, but not the latch mechanism claimed in claims 4 and 5.

Roberts discloses a drawer having a latch mechanism comprising a keyhole shaped bracket (37), and a probe (45) that fits into the keyhole.

The Hunts specification states that a variety of latching mechanisms could be used to hold the door shut (col. 3, line 61).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Hunts apparatus with the latching mechanism of Roberts as an available item used for its stated and intended purpose.

It was also obvious that the probe could have been placed on the door or the side rails, as a matter of design choice. The courts have held that rearrangement of parts is not a patentable distinction (In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975)).

Claims 13-15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch, as discussed above, in view of Shei et al 6644298.

Koch describes a stove having a cabinet (1) having opposing side walls, a top wall, a bottom wall, a back wall, and a front wall defining a heating cavity (see "stove" col. 1, lines 49-51), the front wall defining an opening into the heating cavity; a heating source disposed within the heating cavity (see "stove" col. 1, lines 49-51); a drawer frame (9) having a pair of opposing side rails (14), each of the side rails having a front end and a terminal end (Fig. 1), the side rails being functionally connected with the side

walls of the cabinet in a manner such that the drawer frame can be moved between an open position ("open" in Figure 1) wherein the drawer frame extends substantially exterior of the heating cavity through the opening and a closed position (Figure 2) wherein the drawer frame is positioned substantially within the heating cavity (col. 2, lines 71-73), the front end of the side rails being positioned proximate the front wall and the terminal end being positioned proximate the back wall when the drawer frame is in the closed position (Figures 1 and 2); a door (20) moveably connected to the side rails of the drawer frame, the door moveable between an open position and a closed position; and a locking mechanism (13, 22, 24) in connection between the door and the side rails of the drawer frame for selectively maintaining the door in the closed position.

Regarding claim 15, Figure 2 shows the door closed, and the opening is substantially sealed.

Koch does not disclose a food tray.

Shei et al discloses an oven including removable trays for warming food (element B).

The courts have held that rearrangement of parts is not a patentable distinction (In re Kuhle, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975)). It would have been within the ordinary skill of one in the art to move the Koch drawer apparatus to a location above the heating source.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the Koch apparatus with the Shei et al tray in

order to keep food at a temperature high enough to prevent bacteria contamination (col. 5, lines 2-4).

In apparatus claims, the intended use is given little patentable weight. The Koch in view of Shei apparatus has the claimed structure, and is capable of performing the intended use. (See *In re Schrader*, 22 F.3d 290, 297-98, 30 USPQ2d 1455, 1461-62 (Fed. Cir. 1994))

The method claim 18 is rejected because the prior art apparatus of Koch in view of Shei et al performs the identical steps as claimed.

12. Claims 16, 17, 19, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koch in view of Shei et al as applied to claims 13-15 and 18 above, and further in view of Roberts.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Koch in view of Shei et al apparatus with the latching mechanism of Roberts as an available item used for its stated and intended purpose.

It was also obvious that the probe could have been placed on the door or the side rails, as a matter of design choice. The courts have held that rearrangement of parts is not a patentable distinction (*In re Kuhle*, 526 F.2d 553, 188 USPQ 7 (CCPA 1975)).

The method claims 19 and 20 are rejected because the prior art apparatus of Koch/Shei et al in view of Roberts performs the identical steps as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sarah Suereth whose telephone number is (571) 272-9061. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday 7:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ehud Gartenberg can be reached on (571) 272-4828. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sarah Suereth
Sarah Suereth
Examiner
Art Unit 3749

Ehud Gartenberg

EHUD GARTENBERG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER